

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include the replacement of original FIG. 1 with a new FIG. 1. These two sheets, which include new FIG. 1 and original FIGS. 2-4.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets
Annotated Sheets Showing Changes

REMARKS/AMENDMENTS

This paper addresses the issues raised in the Office Action mailed 29 June 2005. This amendment is submitted in compliance with the guidelines of the revised amendment practice. See 1267 Off. Gazette 106.

Claims 1-11 are currently pending. In the Office Action of 29 June 2005, the Examiner issued a restriction requirement as to a first group of claims, Claims 1-8, and a second group of claims, Claims 9-11; a species election; and Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st and 2nd paragraphs. Claims 1-6 and 8 have been amended. Claims 9-11 have been canceled. New Claim 12 has been added. The specification and drawings have been amended. No new matter has been added. Further, the restriction requirement and the species election have been addressed.

RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

In the Office Action, the Examiner issued a restriction requirement as to a first group of claims, Claims 1-8, and a second group of claims, Claims 9-11. Accordingly, Applicant elects to prosecute the first group of claims, Claims 1-8, with traverse.

SPECIES ELECTION

In the Office Action, the Examiner issued a species election. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that three different species of the invention was shown in Figures 2, 3 and 4. Claim 1 has been amended such that the claimed subject matter encompasses the variations illustrated in Figures 2-4. The features shown in these Figures are set forth in dependant Claims 2-5. Accordingly, Applicant submits that in light of the amendments to Claim 1, no election required. Reconsideration of the election is requested. In the event that a species election is required, then Applicant elects the species shown in Figure 2 with the corresponding claims to be Claims 1, 2, 6, 8 and 12. Applicant makes this election with traverse.

CLAIMS REJECTION - 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1ST PARAGRAPH

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claim 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph as not being described in exact terms. Claims 1-6, and 8 have been amended. Claim 7 was canceled and rewritten as new Claim 12. Claims 9-11 have been canceled.

In making this rejection, the Examiner indicated the claimed invention was not described in concise and exact terms. The specification has been amended to further clarify the claimed invention. No new matter has been added. Specifically, the claimed invention is directed toward a vaporization chamber capable of being pre-heated prior the introduction of an aqueous mixture. The specification, as amended, sets this forth in concise and exact terms. No new matter has been added. See, page 5, 2nd and 3rd paragraphs and page 8, 2nd and 3rd paragraphs. Additionally, FIG. 1 has been canceled and replaced with a new FIG. 1 (informal) showing a schematic of the inventive vaporization chamber assembly. No new matter has been added.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the application is presented in a manner sufficient to satisfy Section 112. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.


CLAIMS REJECTION - 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2ND PARAGRAPH

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claim 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 1-6, and 8 have been amended. Claim 7 was canceled and rewritten as new Claim 12. Claims 9-11 have been canceled. The Examiner rejected these claims as including the term "independent source." These claims have been amended to remove this term. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the application is presented in a manner sufficient to satisfy Section 112. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION





Based on the above, the Applicant respectfully submits the claimed invention, as amended, is presented in a manner sufficient to satisfy Section 112. It is believed that no additional fees are required with the filing of this paper. In the event, however, fees are due with this paper, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,


Brent A. Capenart
Reg. No. 39,620

Dated: September 29, 2005
LARIVIERE, GRUBMAN & PAYNE, LLP
Post Office Box 3140
Monterey, CA 93942
(831) 649-8800

ANOTATED SHEET 1 of 2





ADD AND REPLACE ORIGINALLY
FILED FIG. 2.